

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application for the reasons set forth herein.

### **Claim Amendments**

Applicant has amended Claim 7 to more distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “service provider” has been amended to “provider of services” in Claim 7, which is supported throughout the Specification, but more specifically, for example, on page 12, lines 4-14, of the Specification. Applicant affirms that any reference in the claims to any service provider or provider of service does not refer to an internet service provider in particular and such fact is supported, for example, in the Specification on page 12, lines 4-14.

### **35 U.S.C § 102(a) Rejections**

Claims 1-12, 14-15, 30-37, 39, 54-61, and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as being anticipated by Blumenthal CA2295289A1 (“Blumenthal”). Reconsideration of the present Application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C § 102(a) provides:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless — (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Consistently, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814F.2d 628, 631; 2 USPQ2d 1051,1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Blumenthal Does Not Teach the Formation of At Least Two Organizational Information Protocols

Independent Claims 1 and 29 disclose a method for migrating information comprising:

extracting organizational information from at least two providers of services *to form at least two organizational information protocols*, wherein one organizational information protocols corresponds to each of the at least two providers services ....

The present Office Action contends that Blumenthal teaches this step. Specifically, the Office Action provides:

According to Blumenthal, “a *portal object* is created for each provider. The portal object is specific to a particular provider and is able to handle the data organization and format of that provider. The portal object also supplies routines that enable the user information stored on an internet-based service provider to be located and transferred” (Blumenthal, pg. 9, lines 7-10). In addition, Blumenthal discloses, “in figure 2, either destination portal, 72, source portal 70, or a user may initiate the transfer or migration of user information 74 to destination portal 72. Once user information 74 is extracted from source portal 70, it may be reformatted and stored as user information 76 on destination portal 72” (Blumenthal, pg. 18, lines 11-14). Hence, Blumenthal teaches of migrating a subscriber’s account information from one service provider to another service provider by first extracting the subscriber’s account information from the source of service provider and reformatting the subscriber’s account information for the destination service provider.

(Present Office Action at 3-4 (emphasis added).)

Applicant respectfully contends that these excerpts from Blumenthal do not disclose the formation of organizational information protocols. Blumenthal discloses the creation of “portal objects,” either source portals or destination portals, that locate and transfer “user information.” Applicant, on the other hand, claims the formation of specific “organizational information protocols.” As provided in Applicant’s Specification:

The organizational information protocol extracted from the at least two service providers at step 12 is a *master setup*, extracted in order *to provide a framework*

into which personal information can be sent and received. Upon extraction at step 12, the organizational information may be placed, for example, into an organizational information protocol database organized by service provider as part of step 12. The organization information may be imported by an importer during the extraction step 12, and the information imported reflects the manner of organization, information entry methods, and information extraction methods, of a service provider site. For example, the organization information protocol would include the keys, such as html keys, that precede particular pieces of information on a service provider site (i.e. the key "name" precedes the user's name). This keyed information reflects the manner of organization of the information on the service provider. Further, organization information protocol would include the numerical format, or ranges, in which items must be placed for a given service provider.

Further, as discussed hereinabove, the organizational information might include the manner of entry of information to the site. For example, a script can be generated by the method of migrating during the extraction step, which script can be used later for a normalization step, and which script reflects the entry keys that precede or occur with the entry of information by a user, and this information would be extracted as part of the organization information protocol for each service provider.

(Application at 15.)

Thus, Applicant's organizational information protocols are quite distinct from the portal objects disclosed by Blumenthal. Applicant's protocols do not merely store and transfer account information, but provide a "master setup" or "framework" of the provider's organizational information, such as the html keys that precede a particular piece of account information. Once formed, the protocol then allows the transfer of account information.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Blumenthal does not teach or suggest a method for migrating information comprising extracting organizational information from at least two providers of services to form at least two organizational information protocols. Thus, Applicant's independent Claims 1 and 29 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record, as are dependent Claims 2-28 and 30-52 by virtue of their respective dependency from base Claims 1 and 29.

Blumenthal Does Not Teach Normalizing the First Plurality of Information Into a Standard Format or Denormalizing the Normalized First Plurality of Information into a Second Plurality of Information

Independent Claim 53 discloses a method for migrating information comprising:

... normalizing the first plurality of information into a standard format;  
...denormalizing the normalized first plurality of information into a second plurality of information ....

The Present Office Action clearly provides that “Blumenthal does *not* explicitly disclose” these elements. (Office Action at 14, (emphasis added).)

Pursuant to this concession, Applicant respectfully submits that Blumenthal does not teach or suggest the above normalizing and denormalizing elements. Thus, Applicant’s independent Claim 53 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record, as are dependent Claims 54-74 by virtue of their ultimate dependency from base Claim 53.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 16-24, 29, 40-43, 46-48, 53, 64-67, 69-70 and 75-78 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenthal in view of Abrams, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,608 (“Abrams”).

35 U.S.C. §103(a) recites:

[a] patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

Blumenthal Does Not Teach the Formation of At Least Two Organizational Information Protocols

As previously discussed, the present Office Action contends that Blumenthal teaches a method for migrating information comprising “extracting organizational information from at least two providers of services to form at least two organizational information protocols ....” (Present Office Action at 9-10.) As further discussed, Applicant respectfully submits that Blumenthal does not teach or suggest the formation of organizational information protocols. Thus, Applicant’s independent Claims 1 and 29 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record, as are dependent Claims 2-28 and 30-52 by virtue of their respective dependency from base Claims 1 and 29.

Blumenthal and Abrams Do Not Teach Normalizing the Plurality of Information Into a Standard Format or Denormalizing the Normalized First Plurality of Information Into a Second Plurality of Information.

Independent Claim 53 discloses a method for migrating information comprising:

- ... normalizing the first plurality of information into a standard format;
- ...denormalizing the normalized first plurality of information into a second plurality of information ....

Similarly, independent Claim 75 discloses a migrator for migrating personalized services comprising:

- A normalizer that receives a first plurality of information from said importer and converts the first plurality to a standard format;

A denormalizer that receives the standard format from said normalizer and converts the standard format to a second plurality of information ....

The Present Office Action states that these elements are not disclosed in Blumenthal, but are disclosed in Abrams. (See Present Office Action at 14-16.) In support of this contention, the present Office Action states as follows:

Abrams discloses, “invention’s data migration rules and translation and transformation patterns provide support for mapping several sources of data into a single destination” (Abrams, col. 18, lines 4-6). In addition, Abrams discloses, “the logic behind the Migration Engine accommodates the universe of possible data modeling relationships in mapping Source Data to Destination Data” (Abrams, col. 13, lines 47-49). In addition, Abrams discloses, “the Data Map Architect provides a format to associate the data in the source system ... with the data in destination system. The Data Map Architect uses knowledge about the characteristics, structure, and format of data in the destination tables to facilitates the match between the source data and the destination table” (Abrams, col. 12, lines 24-30). In addition, Abrams discloses, “[accommodating] all of the different translations and tranformations of data” (Abrams, col. 5, lines 38-40). by mapping or associating corresponding objects between the organizations.

(Present Office Action at 14-15.)

The present Office Action concludes, “Hence, Abrams teaches of a method for migrating data between sources or entities by mapping or associating corresponding objects between the organizations.” (Present Office Action at 15.)

Applicant respectfully contends that the above excerpts from Abrams do not disclose the normalization and denormalization elements of Claims 53 and 75. While Abrams discloses a method for migrating data, Abrams does *not* disclose the steps of *normalizing* the first plurality of information and then *denormalizing* that information into a second plurality of information. Similarly, Abrams does not disclose a normalizer or denormalizer.

As indicated in the Specification, “normalization 26 is performed by receiving personal information data according to the organizational information protocol for the migrate-from

service provider, and placing the received personal information data into a normalized, i.e. universal, format. (Application at 20, lines 13-17.) Abrams discloses no such “universalizing” format for migrating pluralities of information.

For at least these reasons, neither Blumenthal nor Abrams individually or in combination teach or suggest the method for migrating comprising normalizing a first plurality of information and then denormalizing. Further, Blumenthal and Abrams do not teach a migrator comprising such a normalizer or denormalizer. Thus, Applicant’s independent Claims 53 and 75 are patently distinguishable over the prior art of record, as are dependent Claims 54-74 and 76-81 by virtue of their respective dependency from base Claims 53 and 75.

### **Conclusion**

Wherefore, Applicant respectfully believes all outstanding grounds raised by the Examiner have been addressed, and thus respectfully submits the present case is in condition for allowance, early notification of which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
**REED SMITH LLP**

Edward F. Behm, Jr.  
Reg. No. 52,606  
Todd A. Norton  
Reg. No. 48,636  
Thomas J. McWilliams  
Reg. No. 44,930  
2500 One Liberty Place  
1650 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7301  
(215) 851-8100

Attorneys for Applicant